





sensors of Schulman are surrounded with a silicone rubber sheet, clearly precluding their use in small size capillaries. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 18, and dependent claims 19 through 21, are patentable over Schulman.

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovacs in view of published U.S. Patent Application 2002/01176592 Lieber. As discussed above, claim 1, as amended, from which claims 6 and 7 depend, is submitted as being patentable over Kovacs. Therefore, claims 6 and 7 are patentable over Kovacs for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovacs in view of Lieber and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,391,147 to Imran. Claim 9 depends indirectly from claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, as discussed above is submitted as being patentable over Kovacs. Therefore, claim 9 is patentable over Kovacs for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovacs in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,615,067 to Hoek. Claims 12 and 13 depend indirectly from claim 10. Claim 10, as amended, as discussed above is submitted as being patentable over Kovacs. Therefore, claims 12 and 13 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 10.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovacs in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,913,160 to John. Claim 16 is dependent indirectly on claim 10. Claim 10, as amended, as discussed above is submitted as being patentable over Kovacs. Therefore, claim 16 is patentable over Kovacs for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 10.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovacs in view of John and further in view of Lieber. Claim 17 is dependent indirectly on claim 10. Claim



Each and every point raised in the Official Action of December 3, 2004 has been addressed by way of the present Amendment and Remarks. However, if the Examiner believes that direct contact with applicant's attorney will assist in the examination of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney as indicated below. Applicant's attorney respectfully requests that the present application be examined and passed on to issue.

Dated: May 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Pierre R. Yanney  
Pierre R. Yanney

Registration No.: 35,418  
DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
P.O. Box 5257  
New York, New York 10150-5257  
(212) 527-7700  
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)  
Attorneys For Applicant